

RESPONSE AND REMARKS

REPLY PERIOD

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that the period for reply to the Final Office Action would expire three months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

However, for the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that fees due for the filing of a Request for Continued Examination are properly based on the April 26, 2005 mailing date of the Advisory Action as opposed to three months from the date of the Final Rejection. It is respectfully submitted that the Response After Final Rejection was timely filed in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a), via U.S. Mail with an appropriate certificate of mailing, on March 12, 2005; it is respectfully submitted that the filing was within the two-month statutory period from the January 14, 2005 mailing date of the Final Office Action.

Attached hereto as evidence of the March 12, 2005 mailing date are:

- 1.) A copy of the certificate of mailing on March 12, 2005 from the first page of the Response After Final Rejection, signed by the below-signed practitioner;
- 2.) A copy of the certificate of mailing on March 12, 2005 on the Transmittal of the Response After Final Rejection, also signed by the below-signed practitioner;
- 3.) A copy of the Certificate of Mailing of the Response After Final Rejection, postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service, as it was personally delivered to the Post Office by the below-signed practitioner, as mailed on March 12, 2005;
- 4.) A copy of the receipt, dated March 12, 2005, from the U.S. Postal Service for the fee paid for the Certificate of Mailing of the Response After Final Rejection; and
- 5.) A copy of the return postcard stamped by the U.S. Patent Office as received by the Patent Office on March 15, 2005.

Because this Amendment and Response is filed before the expiration of one month from the April 26, 2005 mailing date of the Advisory Action, it is respectfully submitted that the Petition for an Extension of Time of one month

and the fee for a one-month extension of time that are filed concurrently herewith are appropriate.

REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 103

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,240; "Boone") and Andric et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,449,200; "Andric") in view of Irons (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,165; "Irons").

With respect to Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-10, the Examiner stated that:

Boone substantially discloses a system/method for assisting formatted data transfer that allows a formatting storage controller to read and record data on a formatted storage medium (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein said a method for selecting a media type format for which to generate value-bearing item indicia), said method comprising: Receiving from a user an input; and identifying a media type format (see., abstract, col 4, lines 13-31, col 5, lines 12-38, specifically wherein said the formatting storage controller may select by reference a number of on-media structure definition.

Final Office Action, Topic Number 4, page 2.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner conceded that "Boone fails to explicitly disclose the step of securing paper control number." However, in support of the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-10, the Examiner stated that:

Andric discloses a security paper for incorporation in a security document, or other document having intrinsic value. . . . It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the formatted data of Boone by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Andric because this would verify the authenticity of the documents or papers.

Final Office Action, Topic Number 4, page 3.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner found that "Boone and Andric fail to disclose Applicant's newly added limitation wherein said secured paper control number comprises a serial number that uniquely corresponds to a particular unit."

However, in support of the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-10, the Examiner stated that:

Irons discloses a system and method for indexing, imaging, storing, and retrieving paper-based documents. Wherein each paper-based documents [sic] has a unique serial number associated with it or each document number will be globally unique or security code (see., abstract, col 11, lines 27-67, col 12, lines 1-17). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Boone and Andric by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Irons because this would allow users to index and label documents prior to scanning/formatting documents or papers.

Final Office Action, Topic Number 4, page 3.

With respect to Claims 2 and 5, the Examiner stated in the Final Office Action that:

Boone substantially discloses a system/method for assisting formatted data transfer that allows a formatting storage controller to read and record data on a formatted storage medium (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein said a method for selecting a media type format for which to generate value-bearing item indicia), said method comprising: Receiving an input; and identifying a media type format (see., abstract, col 4, lines 13-31, col 5, lines 12-38, specifically wherein said the formatting storage controller may select by reference a number of on-media structure definition.

Final Office Action, Topic Number 4, pages 3-4.

The Examiner stated that "Boone fails to explicitly disclose the step of securing paper control number ...", but supported the rejection of Claims 2 and 5, stating that:

Andric discloses a security paper for incorporation in a security document, or other document having intrinsic value. . . . It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the formatted data of Boone by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Andric because this would verify the authenticity of the documents or papers.

The rejections by the Examiner have been carefully considered. Amendments to Claims 1-10 are filed concurrently herewith to more distinctly claim the invention. New Claims 11-13 have been added. Entry of the

amendments and new claims, and consideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that Boone, Andric, and Irons, whether considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claim 1. Independent Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method for selecting a media type format for which to generate generic postage indicia, said method comprising:

- displaying to a display device in communication with a computer device, an input field for inputting a secured paper control number input;
- receiving from a user, via the computer device, the secured paper control number input, wherein said secured paper control number input comprises a serial number that uniquely corresponds to a particular unit of secured paper label stock, wherein said particular unit of secured paper label stock comprises a plurality of labels, and wherein the serial number is visible on each label of the particular unit of secured paper label stock;
- identifying a media type format, according to the serial number, for formatting at least one generic postage label; and
- calculating according to the media type format at least one of: a size of a generic postage indicia for printing on an at least one label on the particular unit of secured paper label stock, and a print location of the generic postage indicia for printing on the at least one label on the particular unit of secured paper label stock.

Various embodiments of the method claimed in amended Claim 1 allow a way for a user to input information available to the user on secured paper label stock on which the user wants to print generic postage, so that a media type format for formatting the generic postage can be identified. The method claimed in amended Claim 1 may be useful in selecting a media type format for which to generate generic postage indicia in view of a growing number of available and supported media types. See, e.g., Specification, page 3, line 21 through page 4, line 2.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Boone, Andric, and Irons, whether considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claim 4. Independent Claim 4, as amended, is directed to a method for determining a media type for a particular unit of secured paper label stock,

wherein the particular unit of secured paper label stock comprises a plurality of labels, said method comprising:

receiving from a user, via a computer device, an input of a serial number, wherein the serial number is displayed on each label of the particular unit of secured paper label stock, and wherein the serial number uniquely identifies the particular unit of secured paper label stock;

retrieving from a computer-accessible memory storage, a record corresponding to the serial number, wherein said record comprises a media type format corresponding to the serial number;

calculating according to the media type format at least one of: a size of a value-bearing item indicia for printing on at least one label on the particular unit of secured paper label stock, and a print location of the value-bearing item indicia for printing on the at least one label on the particular unit of secured paper label stock.

Various embodiments of the method claimed in amended Claim 4 allow a way for determining a media type for a particular unit of secured paper label stock according to a user input of information available to the user on the secured paper label stock so that value-bearing item indicia can be formatted (see dependent Claim 7), or so that, e.g., a label stock preview display can be generated (see dependent Claim 5). The method claimed in Claim 4 may be useful for determining a media type for a particular unit of secured paper label stock in view of a growing number of available and supported media types. See, e.g., Specification, page 3, line 21 through page 4, line 2.

Yet further, it is respectfully submitted that Boone, Andric, and Irons, whether considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claim 8. Amended independent Claim 8 is directed to a method for identifying to a system a secured paper media type, said method comprising:

displaying on a particular unit of secured paper label stock a unique secured paper identifier, wherein the particular unit of secured paper label stock corresponds to a particular media type, and wherein said particular media type is characterized by a corresponding set of media type information;

recording on at least one database a relationship between the unique secured paper identifier and the corresponding set of media type information; and

responding to an input by a user, via a computer device, of at least the unique secured paper identifier, by generating an at least one value-bearing item indicia for printing on an at least one label of the secured paper label stock, wherein the at least one value-bearing item indicia is generated in a format according to the corresponding set of media type information.

Various embodiments of the method claimed in amended Claim 8 allow a way for identifying to a system a secured paper media type for a particular unit of secured paper label stock on which the user wants to print a value-bearing item, so that value-bearing item indicia can be generated according to a format according to a set of media type information that corresponds to the particular unit of secured paper label stock. The method claimed in Claim 8 may be useful for identifying to a system a secured paper media type in view of a growing number of available and supported media types. See, e.g., Specification, page 3, line 21 through page 4, line 2.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that because none of Boone, Andric, or Irons, whether considered alone or in combination with each other or with any other reference of record discloses, anticipates or suggests all of the limitations of independent Claims 1, 4 and 8, as amended, of the present application, those claims are patentable over the cited references. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-3, 5-7 and 9-13, which are dependent on amended independent Claims 1, 4 and 8 respectively, are therefore also patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the invention disclosed and claimed in the present application is not fairly taught by

Application Serial No. 10/688,548

Amendment and Response With Request for Continued Examination

any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By



Marilyn R. Khorsandi
Reg. No. 45,744
626/796-2856